



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,483	10/18/2001	Lisa F. Frey	20569	7012

210 7590 02/24/2003

MERCK AND CO INC  
P O BOX 2000  
RAHWAY, NJ 070650907

EXAMINER

COVINGTON, RAYMOND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/982,483

Applicant(s)

FREY ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Covington

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claims 1-31, in part, are drawn to compounds wherein A is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably independent and distinct inventions including, for example, O-heterocyclic derivatives classified in 549/200+, S-heterocyclic derivatives classified in 549/1+, polycyclic thiomorpholine derivatives classified in 544/60+, polycyclic morpholine derivatives classified in 544/101+, diazine derivatives classified in 544/224+, thiodiazine derivatives classified in 544/8+, benzothiazine classified in 544/49+, isoquinoline derivatives classified in 546/139+, tropane derivatives classified in 546/124+, oxazole derivatives classified in 548/240+, thiodiazole derivatives classified in 548/125+, 568/38+, 568/630+, and various other inventions too numerous to recite.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP g 806.04, MPEP e 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions do not have a common core and have different bonding and properties and thus different functions.

The above claims are objected to as being drawn to an improper Markush group on the grounds of lack of a common nucleus. The terms A,

Art Unit: 1625

R1-R7 have so many variables and hence so many permutations and combinations that a prior art reference anticipating the claims with respect to one member under 35 USC 102(b) would not render obvious the same claims under 35 USC 103a with respect to another member. The improper Markush group rejection finds basis in case law, compare *In re Swenson* 56 USPQ 180; *In re Ruzicka*, 66 USPQ 226; *In re Winnek*, 73 USPQ 225; *In re Harnisch*, 206 USPQ 300, 305 (CCPA 1980).

In view of the foregoing, restriction is required to the following inventions under 35 USC 121.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for one Group is not required for any other Group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. This election should contain one species designating one A ring, from formula I as well as one R1 and one R7 if they are heterocyclic.

Upon election, the Examiner will review the claims and indicate (a) a generic concept inclusive of the elected species {compounds which are so similar thereto as to be part of the elected matter} and (b) by such indication (i.e. by exclusion) which compounds are drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (703) 308-4704. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, A. Rotman can be reached on (703) 308-0204. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7922 for regular communications and (703) 308-7922 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Raymond Covington  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1625

*Rkc*

Rkc

February 19, 2003

*Alan L. Rotman*

ALAN L. ROTMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600